

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

BRIAN E. LEPLEY,	)	3:11-cv-00781-LRH-WGC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u></b>
	)	
vs.	)	April 25, 2013
	)	
ROBERT LEGRAND, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

**MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:**

Before the court is Plaintiff's Objection and Motion to Compel. (Doc. # 173). Plaintiff attaches as "Exhibit One" a Notice defendant Reed provided regarding the verification of his (defendant Reed's) answers to interrogatories which in addition to attesting to the accuracy of his answers to interrogatories, includes a representation that he (Mr. Reed) retired from NDOC in August of 2012 and that he is now employed by the University of Wisconsin (*id.*, at 8). The Verification was provided pursuant to a court order entered on February 21, 2013 (Doc. # 131) which directed defendants' counsel to provide Mr. Reed's verification to his answers to interrogatories and to provide in that verification the date of his (Mr. Reed's) retirement. (Doc. # 173 at 11).

As best as the court can ascertain, plaintiff's motion complains that defendants' counsel did not provide NDOC documentation as to when Mr. Reed retired (he wants it "notarized under penalty of perjury the day month year ending Mr. Reed's employment...") *id.* at 1. The court, however, did not direct NDOC to provide such information; the court did direct defendants' counsel when providing his client's verification to his discovery responses to also state when he retired. This Mr. Reed did as shown in Doc. # 173 at 5. Thus, there is nothing to "compel" in this respect.

Therefore, Plaintiff's motion (Doc. # 173) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: /s/  
Deputy Clerk